



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/808,463	03/14/2001	Philippe Bordes	PF000020	3543

7590 01/03/2005

Joseph S. Tripoli
THOMSON multimedia Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312 - Two Independence Way
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER

PHILIPPE, GIMS S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2613

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/808,463

Applicant(s)

BORDES ET AL

Examiner

Gims S Philippe

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11 and 12 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment received on July 22, 2004 in which claims 1, 2, and 7-10 were amended, and claims 11-12 were added has been fully considered and entered but the arguments are not deemed to be persuasive.

Note: The examiner acknowledges the amendment made to the claims, however, no new prior art is required to show the additional limitation of amended claim 10.

The rejection is repeated for the sake of completeness.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun et al. (US Patent no. 6,678,416) in view of Ito et al. (US Patent no. 6,377,309).

As per claim 10, Sun et al. discloses a process for coding video images comprising a step of extraction of at least one video object from an image originating from a sequence of images (See Sun col. 5, lines 22-24), by the construction of a

Art Unit: 2613

segmentation key defining the contours of the object in the image (See Sun col. 2, lines 21-23), a step of coding the video object according to a non-object based coding standard so as to form an elementary stream, a step of coding the segmentation key relating to the video object, according to the standard, so as to form an elementary stream, a step of coding a background image into which the object is to be inserted, according to the MPEG 2 standard, so as to form an elementary stream (See Sun col. 5, lines 23-30).

It is noted that Sun is silent about using elementary streams to provide program streams as specified in the claim.

However, Ito discloses using elementary streams so as to provide a transport stream (See Ito col. 4, lines 21-25, and col. 11, lines 61-67).

Therefore, it is considered obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention would recognize the advantage of modifying Sun's encoding process by incorporating Ito's step of using elementary streams so as to provide one transport stream. The motivation for performing such modification in Sun is to provide the information that the user desires in the form of an image in order to improve the visual effect as taught by Ito (See Ito col. 3, lines 49-54).

4. Claims 1-9 and 11-12 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

5. The applicant argues that the present invention is a process and device "for coding images according to a non-object based coding standard" i.e. the MPEG-2 standard. This distinction is made clear in amended claims 1, 9 and 10. Specifically, both Sun et al. and Ito et al. neither disclose nor suggest multiplexing (4, 6, 7) the elementary streams relating to one or more objects and to the background image so as to provide a program stream (PS) or transport stream (TS) according to (the non object-based coding) standard" as in the present claimed invention.

In response to the above arguments, the examiner notes that since claim 10 is neither directed to multiplexing nor to any specific process, method or device, the previous rejection is considered applicable to the broad limitations of such claim.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of


Art Unit: 2613

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gims S Philippe whose telephone number is (703) 305-1107. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-7:00) Second Monday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris S Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4780. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Gims S Philippe
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2613

GSP

December 27, 2004